

REMARKS

Claims 1-31 are currently pending in this application. No claims are amended, added, or canceled. In view of the following remarks, reconsideration and allowance of all rejected claims is respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) and §103(a)

Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 8-10, 12-16, 18, 20, 22-24, and 26-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Markus (U.S. Patent No. 6,499,042, "Markus '042"). Claims 3 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Markus '042 in view of Markus et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,490,601, "Markus '601"). Claims 5, 11, 19, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Markus '042 in view of Wong (U.S. Patent No. 5,956,699). Claims 7 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Markus '042 in view of Rhoads (U.S. Patent No. 6,285,776).

In a Final Office Action dated April 6, 2004, the Examiner asserts that because of the clarifying language added to independent claims 1, 15, and 29, "the examiner now considers the external entity, document browser 13, selective proxy 14, and document 15, of Markus '042 to be equivalent to the user, client, intermediary, and server, respectively, as presently claimed by applicant." Even viewed in light of the Examiner's "new" consideration of the claim elements, Markus '042 and the other applied references still do not teach each and every element of the pending claims.

Claim 1 recites, among other things, "a method of ***processing requests from a client*** for electronic documents located at a server" comprising "receiving, ***by an intermediary*** disposed between the client and the server, a request ***from the client*** for an electronic document located at a first address at the server, ***the request made by a user at the client***" (*Emphasis Added*). At least these features are not disclosed by Markus '042. In fact, Markus '042 describes a completely different invention wherein a request for a document is made directly from a document browser to a document server (column 3, lines 22-27).

The Examiner refers to column 3, lines 29-31 of Markus '042, alleging that Markus '042 teaches receiving, by an intermediary, a request for a document located at a server and that the request is made by a user at the client. However, it appears that the Examiner has ignored the preceding lines which specifically recite that the external entity instructs the document browser to fetch the desired document, the **document browser** then contacts the **document server**, to request the document, and the document server returns the requested document. Thus, in accordance with the Examiner's interpretation, a user instructs a client to request a desired document. The client then contacts a server to request a document which is returned by the server to the client and on to the user. If the user then desires to have the already retrieved document automatically filled, the user activates an autofill trigger which causes the client to contact an intermediary to retrieve information. Once the user has entered login information, the intermediary then contacts the server and requests the same document already requested and obtained by the client. This is not the same as an intermediary receiving a request from a user at the client for a document located at the server, as recited in the claim.

At best, Markus '042 discloses that once a user has retrieved a desired document directly from the server, the user may then request that the already retrieved document go through an auto-fill process. The Examiner also references column 3, lines 36-44 of Markus '042, which states "the Selective Proxy contacts the same Document Server and the Document Browser connected in 14 and requests the exact same document." However, this is not a request **from a user at the client** for a document. The user has already requested and retrieved the document directly from the server.

For at least these reasons, Markus '042 does not disclose each and every element of Claim 1. Thus claim 1 is patentable over Markus '042. Independent claims 15 and 29 recite similar features and are therefore patentable over Markus '042 for at least the same reasons.

Dependent claims 2-14 and 16-28 each depend from and add additional features to one of independent claims 1, 15, and 29. Markus '042 is deficient in teaching or

suggesting each of the features of the independent claims for at least the foregoing reasons. None of the references relied upon by the Examiner, either alone or in combination with one another, compensate for the deficiencies of Markus '042 set forth above. For at least this reason, Applicant respectfully submits that dependent claims 2-14 and 16-31 are patentable over the references relied upon by the Examiner.

Having addressed the foregoing rejections, it is respectfully submitted that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the application is in condition for allowance. Notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Dated: 6 July '04

Respectfully submitted,



Rick A. Toering
Registration No.: 43,195
MINTZ, LEVIN, COHN, FERRIS, GLOVSKY AND
POPEO P.C.
12010 Sunset Hills Road, Suite 900
Reston, Virginia 20190
703-464-4806

Customer No.
29315